

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

§
BRUCE BECKER and LILIANA
BECKER, §
§
Plaintiffs, §
§
v. § Case No. 6:21-cv-161-JDK-JDL
§
CITIBANK N.A., et al., §
§
Defendants. §
§

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiffs Bruce and Liliana Becker, proceeding pro se, bring this civil action alleging claims of Texas Deceptive Trade Practices Act violations, breach of contract, promissory estoppel, negligent misrepresentation, emotional distress, and fraud. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge John D. Love for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for disposition.

Before the Court are Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction and amended motion for preliminary injunction. Docket Nos. 12, 16. On July 29, 2021, Judge Love issued a Report recommending that the Court deny Plaintiffs' motions. Docket No. 25. The Report was served on all parties via the Court's electronic filing system, CM/ECF. No objections to the Report have been filed.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court

examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law.

Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, Plaintiff did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 25) as the findings of this Court. It is therefore **ORDERED** that Plaintiffs' motions for a preliminary injunction (Docket Nos. 12, 16) are **DENIED**.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this 18th day of August, 2021.



JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE